DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 476 668 HE 035 881

AUTHOR	MacFarland, Thomas W.
TITLE	Fall Term 1999 Nova Southeastern University Students Respond to a Broad-Based Satisfaction Survey: A Comparison of Students by Age.
INSTITUTION	Nova Southeastern Univ., Ft. Lauderdale, FL. Research and Planning.
REPORT NO	R-01-06
PUB DATE	2001-04-00
NOTE	60p.
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	* Age Differences; *College Students; Computer Uses in Education; Higher Education; Information Technology; Library Services; *Satisfaction; *Student Attitudes; Student Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Nova Southeastern University FL; *Student Support Services

ABSTRACT

This study used data originally gathered about student satisfaction through a survey in fall 1999 at Nova Southeastern University, Florida to determine whether there were differences in the perspectives of students aged 25 years or younger and those aged 26 years and older. At Nova Southeastern, more than 80% of all fall 1999 students were 26 or older. Survey results show that students generally have positive opinions about the university and the many services it offers. There were a few areas where satisfaction levels were significantly different. Convenience as a reason for deciding to attend the university had a significantly greater rating by students above age 26. Students 25 or younger indicated a greater level of use of contemporary computer-based media. There was also a disparity in levels of satisfaction with library and library information services, with students 25 and younger indicating a greater level of satisfaction with issues related to access to information through technology, infusion of information technology into the curricula, and provisions for training in the use of technology. An appendix contains the study tables. The survey is attached. (Contains 16 tables and 23 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 476 668

FALL TERM 1999 NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS RESPOND TO A BROAD-BASED SATISFACTION SURVEY: A COMPARISON OF STUDENTS BY AGE (≤ 25 YEARS AND ≥ 26 YEARS)

Thomas W. MacFarland

Senior Research Associate

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. MacFarland

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Nova Southeastern University
Research and Planning

Report 01-06

April 2001

HE035881

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FALL TERM 1999 NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS RESPOND TO A BROAD-BASED SATISFACTION SURVEY: A COMPARISON OF STUDENTS BY AGE (≤ 25 YEARS AND ≥ 26 YEARS)

Thomas W. MacFarland **Senior Research Associate**
Report 01-06 **April 2001**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In preparation for efforts that were focused on the regional accreditation process, Nova Southeastern University's Office of Research and Planning prepared an extensive series of reports in 1996 that related to student satisfaction with academic resources and services. Later, in 1999, the common part of the various 1996 surveys was used to provide an update to the information gained from these prior reports.

The purpose of this study was to use the data set originally gained from the Fall Term 1999 survey process and to focus on survey results from two broad perspectives:

- Students ≤ 25 years
- Students ≥ 26 years

When considering student age, it may be useful to recall that the University has more than a 35 year history of serving the needs of the adult learner. Indeed, in an *ad hoc* analysis of the Fall Term 1999 data set, it was determined that more than 80 percent of all Fall Term 1999 students were ≥ 26 Years.

The collapsed and breakout statistics presented in this report provide evidence that students generally have positive opinions about Nova Southeastern University and the many services offered by the University. However, there were a few areas where levels of satisfaction were significantly different and program directors and administrative personnel may find it helpful to give attention to these findings. It may be especially useful to look at variance between students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) on the following issues:

- The importance of *convenience* as a reason for deciding to attend the University, which had a significantly greater rating by students ≥ 26 years than students ≤ 25 years.
- Differences in the frequency and levels of use of the University's libraries and library services by students in these two age groups.

- Disparity in use of technology-based media in courses, with students ≤ 25 years indicating a greater level of use of contemporary computer-based media such as electronic mail and the World Wide Web.

- Disparity in levels of satisfaction with library and library information services, with students ≤ 25 years indicating a greater level of satisfaction with issues related to access to information through technology, infusion of information technology into the curricula, and provisions for training in the use of technology.

The University is compelled by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to give continual attention to the issue of Institutional Effectiveness. The broadly-inclusive Fall Term 1999 survey process previously identified resulted in a set of reports that had some level of concern on issues related to Institutional Effectiveness and this report should add to the University's attempt to satisfy attention to this area.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Purpose of This Study	2
METHODOLOGY	3
RESULTS	4
SUMMARY	7
REFERENCES	9
APPENDIX: Table 1 to Table 16	12

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Academic Center: Adjusted Data Set	12
2	Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Age Breakout	13
3	Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Degree Level and by Age Breakout	14
4	Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Gender and by Age Breakout	16
5.A	Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Race/Ethnic Group (All Race/Ethnic Groups) and by Age Breakout	17
5.B	Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Race/Ethnic Group (White, non-Hispanic and Minority) and by Age Breakout	19
6	Reasons for Deciding to Attend NSU by Age Breakout	20
7	Number of Courses Completed in This Academic Program by Age Breakout	23
8	Frequency of Library Usage by Age Breakout	25
9	What Survey Respondents Would Have Done If They Had Not Attended Nova Southeastern University by Age Breakout	29
10	Technology-Based Media Experienced in Courses by Age Breakout	31
11	Statements About *Faculty* by Age Breakout	33
12	Statements About *Academic Program* and Age Breakout	35
13	Statements About *Administration* by Age Breakout	39
14	Statements About *Library and Information Services* and Age Breakout	42
15	Statements About *Student Services* by Age Breakout	45
16	Statements About *Summary Evaluation* by Age Breakout	48

INTRODUCTION

Background

Nova Southeastern University's Office of Research and Planning previously prepared an extensive series of reports[1] that focused on student satisfaction with academic resources and services. These reports were prepared for a variety of internal and external uses and it was anticipated that they would be used to satisfy reporting requirements linked to reaffirmation of accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

During Fall Term 1999, the common part of the various 1996 surveys was used to prepare a survey that would provide an update to the information gained from these many prior reports. Results of this Fall Term 1999 survey process have since been prepared into a series of more contemporary reports on student satisfaction with academic resources and services:

- *Fall Term 1999 Nova Southeastern University Students Respond to a Broad-Based Satisfaction Survey* (Research and Planning Report 00-09, May 2000)
- *Fall Term 1999 Nova Southeastern University Students Respond to a Broad-Based Satisfaction Survey: Breakouts by Student Service Center Locations* (Research and Planning Report 00-26, December 2000)

---

[1] The abstracts of these reports are available at Research and Planing's listing off the University's home page: <http://www.nova.edu/cwis/urp/researchreports.htm>.

96-02 *Graduates of Nova Southeastern University's Undergraduate Programs Tell Us About Their Undergraduate Experience.*
96-05 *Graduates of the Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education Reflect on Their Experience With Nova Southeastern University.*
96-06 *Graduates of the School of Business and Entrepreneurship Reflect Upon Their Academic Experience.*
96-07 *Graduates of the School of Computer and Information Sciences Offer Judgment on Their Experience With Nova Southeastern University.*
96-08 *South Florida vs. Other Locations: Comparing Student Responses to a Satisfaction Survey.*
96-12 *Students in the Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education Respond to a Satisfaction Survey: A Comparison Between On-Campus Students and Off-Campus Students.*
96-13 *Students in the School of Business and Entrepreneurship Respond to a Satisfaction Survey: A Comparison Between On-Campus Students and Off-Campus Students.*
96-14 *Students in the James M. Farquhar Center for Undergraduate Studies Respond to a Satisfaction Survey: A Comparison Between On-Campus Students and Off-Campus Students.*
96-15 *Students in the School of Computer and Information Sciences Respond to a Satisfaction Survey: Outcomes from an Academic Center Using Computer-Mediated Communication.*
96-23 *July 1, 1995, to June 30, 1996, Graduates of the James M. Farquhar Center for Undergraduate Studies at Nova Southeastern University Offer Judgment on Their University Experience.*

- *Fall Term 1999 Nova Southeastern University Students Respond to a Broad-Based Satisfaction Survey: A Comparison of Campus-Based Students And Distance Education Students* (Research and Planning Report 01-03, February 2001).

Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this study was to use the data set originally gained from the Fall Term 1999 survey process and to focus on survey results from two broad perspectives:

- Students ≤ 25 years
- Students ≥ 26 years

It should be noted that this breakout is not presented as a comparison between (1) undergraduate students v. graduate/professional students or (2) youth v. adult students. Quite the opposite:

1. When viewing the literature, it is clear that there is no specific age where students are automatically classified as either youth or adults:
    - Ashmore (1987) cited 22 years as the age to classify nontraditional adult learners.
    - Robles (1998) focused on adult learners as 24 years or older.
    - Sydow and Sandel (1996) compared students 19 or younger to students between the ages of 20 and 25, which totally excluded students older than 25 years.
    - Knowles (an internationally recognized expert on Adult Education who helped develop the University's Adult Education specialization in the Programs for Higher Education) did not refer to specific ages but instead viewed the adult learner from the viewpoint of practitioner experiences and personal development that had not yet been gained by younger students (*The Adult Learner in Higher Education: A Resource and Planning Guide*, 1989).
2. When considering student age, it may be useful to recall that the University has more than a 35 year history of serving the needs of the adult learner:

- The University was chartered in 1964 and instruction was first offered exclusively to graduate students. It remained until 1976 before the University established Nova College and the offering of undergraduate instruction, ostensibly to younger students, in this college (*Nova Southeastern University Fact Book*; 2001, p. 10).

- The mean age of the University's undergraduate students at time of graduation (1999/2000 graduates) was 33 years (*Nova Southeastern University Fact Book*; 2001, p. 71).

- Further, in an *ad hoc* analysis of the Fall Term 1999 data set, it was determined that more than 80 percent of all Fall Term 1999 students were ≥ 26 Years.

Clearly, the University has a long history of serving the adult learner and the adult learner is widely represented in the University's undergraduate, professional, and graduate programs. This report and the segregation of students into these two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) should be useful as the University prepares measures of institutional effectiveness. This information may also be useful for marketing purposes since the adult learner has represented for more than 40 years a growing market in the consumer-oriented business of post-secondary education (Lencyk, 1980).

METHODOLOGY

The methodology for survey preparation, distribution, and analysis was fully explained in *Fall Term 1999 Nova Southeastern University Students Respond to a Broad-Based Satisfaction Survey* (2000) and *Fall Term 1999 Nova Southeastern University Students Respond to a Broad-Based Satisfaction Survey: Breakouts by Student Service Center Locations* (2000). The representation of the population, invited sample, and responding sample is detailed in Table 1.

There was a wide level of attention to survey instrument distribution instructions by the many faculty, cluster coordinators, site administrators, and academic center contact people associated with this project. As presented in *Fall Term 1999 Nova Southeastern University Students Respond to a Broad-Based Satisfaction Survey* (2000), *Fall Term 1999 Nova Southeastern University Students Respond to a Broad-Based Satisfaction Survey: Breakouts by Student Service Center Locations* (2000), and *Fall Term 1999 Nova Southeastern University Students Respond to a Broad-Based Satisfaction Survey: A Comparison of Campus-Based Students And Distance Education Students* (2001), there was agreement that the responding sample was acceptable in terms of overall representation of the population.

RESULTS

Various characteristics of the responding sample and breakout statistics for students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) are presented in Tables 1 to 16. Along with the detailed information provided in these tables, the most salient results are summarized in the following list:

Table	Result(s)
1	The responding sample is representative of the population in terms of participation by academic center.
2	Since 12 percent of all survey respondents did not mark their age, it is difficult to compare the responding sample to the population, where nearly all students mark their age during the application and/or registration process.
3	There is a difference between students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) in terms of representation by degree level.
4	There is a difference between students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) in terms of representation by gender.
5.A/5.B	There is no difference between students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) in terms of representation by race/ethnicity when collapsed into White, non-Hispanic and Minority breakouts.
6	Students ≤ 25 years, in contrast to students ≥ 26 years, expressed a greater level of agreement to the following reasons for deciding to attend NSU: admissions standards, availability of scholarships or financial aid, location, small class size, and social atmosphere. Students ≥ 26 years, in contrast to students ≤ 25 years, expressed a greater level of agreement to the term convenience as a reason for deciding to attend NSU. Students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) were in agreement in regard to the following reasons for deciding to attend NSU: academic reputation, advice of counselors and teachers, cost, type of programs available, and other.
7	Students ≤ 25 years had completed fewer courses in this academic program than students ≥ 26 years.

8 Students ≤ 25 years use the University's library or library provided services more frequently than students > 26 years.

Students ≤ 25 years use other libraries less frequently than students ≥ 26 years.

9 There was a difference between students ≤ 25 years and students ≥ 26 years in terms of available options if they had not attended NSU.

10 Students ≤ 25 years, in contrast to students ≥ 26 years, expressed a greater level of frequency of experience in courses with the following technology-based media: electronic mail, World Wide Web, other.

Students ≥ 26 years indicated that they had greater frequency of experience with audiobridge and compressed video than was indicated by students ≤ 25 years.

Students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) indicated an equal level of experience with the electronic classroom as a technology-based medium experienced in courses.

11 In terms of statements about the faculty, students ≤ 25 years indicated a higher level of satisfaction with access to full-time faculty and interaction with full-time faculty than was indicated by students ≥ 26 years.

There were no differences in satisfaction between students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) in regard to competency of the faculty.

12 In terms of statements about the academic program, students ≤ 25 years indicated a higher level of satisfaction with the quality of the learning environment, and the adequacy of classroom facilities than was indicated by students ≥ 26 years. In contrast, students ≥ 26 years indicated a higher level of satisfaction with opportunity for peer interaction, and the length of the individual courses than was indicated by students ≤ 25 years.

There were no differences between students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) on all other statements about academic program.

13	Students ≤ 25 years indicated a higher level of satisfaction than students ≥ 26 years on the following statements related to administration: clarity of written completion requirements and clarity of program catalog. For all other statements on administration, there were no differences between students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years).
14	In terms of statements about library and information services, students ≤ 25 years indicated a higher level of satisfaction than students ≥ 26 years on the following statements: access to information through technology, infusion of information technology into the curricula, and provisions for training in the use of technology. In contrast, students ≤ 25 years indicated a lower level of satisfaction than students ≥ 26 years on the following statements about library and information services: availability of library and learning resource materials and adequacy of library and learning resource materials, For all other statements about library and information services, there were no differences between students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years).
15	There were no differences between students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) on statements about student services.
16	There was no difference between students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) on the concluding summary evaluation statement.

When reviewing the summary statistics presented in the attached tables, it should be noted that some results show only a slight difference in means and standard deviations between students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years), yet the difference is judged statistically significant at the ≤ .05 level of significance. As an example, consider the following response from Table 11:

Survey Statement	N	Mean	SD	p	Result (≤ .05)
Interaction with full-time faculty, either through direct contact or other means					
≤ 25 Years	680	4.1	0.9		
≥ 26 Years	1,461	4.0	1.0		
All Respondents	2,410	4.0	1.0	≤ .01	(≤25) > (≥26)

The difference between these means and standard deviations is minimal, yet the statistical analysis associated with this comparison confirmed that the difference in responses between students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) is significant (≤ .05), although it is reasonable to think that the difference is only minimal in terms of *practical* significance. It should be recalled that the data set associated with this study is rather large (N = 2,637 respondents) and Glass and Hopkins (1984, p. 270) and Box, Hunter, and Hunter (1978, p. 50) both provided an excellent discussion of mean comparisons (such as Student's t-distribution and F values) and distribution with large data sets, such that degrees of freedom begin to approach values for infinity. In this case, large sample size and variance can result in statistically significant differences even when group means and standard deviations are similar.

SUMMARY

The collapsed and breakout statistics presented in this report provide evidence that students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) generally have positive opinions about Nova Southeastern University and the many services offered by the University. However, there were a few areas where levels of satisfaction were significantly different and program directors and administrative personnel may find it helpful to give attention to these findings. It may be especially useful to look at variance between students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) on the following issues:

- The importance of *convenience* as a reason for deciding to attend the University, which had a significantly greater rating by students ≥ 26 years than students ≤ 25 years.
- Differences in the frequency and levels of use of the University's libraries and library services by students in these two age groups.

- Disparity in use of technology-based media in courses, with students ≤ 25 years indicating a greater level of use of contemporary computer-based media such as electronic mail and the World Wide Web.

- Disparity in levels of satisfaction with library and library information services, with students ≤ 25 years indicating a greater level of satisfaction with issues related to access to information through technology, infusion of information technology into the curricula, and provisions for training in the use of technology.

The University is compelled by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to give continual attention to the issue of Institutional Effectiveness (*Criteria for Accreditation*; 1998, pp. 19-22). The broadly-inclusive Fall Term 1999 survey process previously identified resulted in a set of reports that had some level of concern on issues related to Institutional Effectiveness and this report should add to the University's attempt to satisfy attention to this area.

REFERENCES

The Adult Learner in Higher Education: A Resource and Planning Guide. (1989). ERIC ED 348911.

Ashmore, Rhea A. (1987). *The Adult Learner: Implications and Activities for Implementation.* ERIC ED 286041.

Box, George, William G. Hunter, and J. Stuart Hunter. (1978). *Statistics for Experimenters: An Introduction to Design, Data Analysis, and Model Building.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. (1998). *Criteria for Accreditation.* Decatur, Georgia.

Fall Term 1999 Nova Southeastern University Students Respond to a Broad-Based Satisfaction Survey. (2000). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 00-09.

Fall Term 1999 Nova Southeastern University Students Respond to a Broad-Based Satisfaction Survey: Breakouts by Student Service Center Locations. (2000). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 00-26.

Fall Term 1999 Nova Southeastern University Students Respond to a Broad-Based Satisfaction Survey: A Comparison of Campus-Based Students And Distance Education Students. (2001). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 01-03.

Glass, Gene V., and Kenneth D. Hopkins. (1984). (2nd edition). *Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Graduates of the Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education Reflect on Their Experience With Nova Southeastern University. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-05.

Graduates of Nova Southeastern University's Undergraduate Programs Tell Us About Their Undergraduate Experience. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-02.

Graduates of the School of Business and Entrepreneurship Reflect Upon Their Academic Experience. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-06.

Graduates of the School of Computer and Information Sciences Offer Judgment on Their Experience With Nova Southeastern University. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-07.

July 1, 1995, to June 30, 1996, Graduates of the James M. Farquhar Center for Undergraduate Studies at Nova Southeastern University Offer Judgment on Their University Experience. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-23.

Lencyk, John A. (1980). *Post-Secondary Education: Entering the Age of the Consumer.* ERIC ED 213298.

Nova Southeastern University Fact Book. (2000). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 00-05.

Nova Southeastern University Fact Book. (2001). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 01-01.

Robles, Harriett J. (1998). *Andragogy, the Adult Learner and Faculty as Learners.* ERIC ED 426740.

South Florida vs. Other Locations: Comparing Student Responses to a Satisfaction Survey. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-08.

Students in the Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education Respond to a Satisfaction Survey: A Comparison Between On-Campus Students and Off-Campus Students. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-12.

Students in the James M. Farquhar Center for Undergraduate Studies Respond to a Satisfaction Survey: A Comparison Between On-Campus Students and Off-Campus Students. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-14.

Students in the School of Business and Entrepreneurship Respond to a Satisfaction Survey: A Comparison Between On-Campus Students and Off-Campus Students. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-13.

Students in the School of Computer and Information Sciences Respond to a Satisfaction Survey: Outcomes from an Academic Center Using Computer-Mediated Communication. (1996).

Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-15.

Sydow, Debbie L., and Robert H. Sandel. (1996). *Making Student Retention an Institutional Priority*. ERIC ED 402961.

APPENDIX

Table 1

Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Academic Center: Adjusted Data Set[2]

Academic Center	Responding Sample N	Responding Sample %	Invited Sample N	Invited Sample %	Population N	Population %
Fischler Graduate School of Education and Human Services	842	32	1,040	31	6,075	34
Farquhar Center for Undergraduate Studies	436	17	800	24	4,006	22
Huizenga Graduate School of Business and Entrepreneurship	258	10	440	13	2,248	13
Center for Psychological Studies	168	6	280	8	987	5
Health Professions Division	455	17	400	12	2,605	15
Shepard Broad Law Center	164	6	200	6	949	5
School of Computer and Information Sciences	208	8	120	4	683	4
School of Social and Systemic Studies	71	3	66	2	284	2
Oceanographic Center	35	1	20	<1	117	<1
Total	2,637		3,366		17,954	

Note. Fall Term 1999 enrollment population data are from *Nova Southeastern University Fact Book 2000* (2000, p. 50).

[2] The adjusted data set (N = 2,637) will be used for all analyses presented in this report.

Table 2

Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Age Breakout

Age Breakout	Survey Return		Age			
	N	%	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
≤ 25 Years	716	27	24	23	22.5	2.5
≥ 26 Years	1,616	61	28	37	38.3	8.9
Unidentified	305	12				
All Respondents	2,637		24	31	33.4	10.5

Note: Using the results of an unpublished *ad hoc* analysis of the Fall Term 1999 data set, age breakouts were: ≤ 25 Years = 17 percent, ≥ 26 Years = 83 percent, and Unidentified = < 1 percent. Further, descriptive statistics of age from the Fall Term 1999 data set were: Mode = 26, Median = 33, Mean = 35.2, and SD = 10.2.

Since 12 percent of all survey respondents did not mark their age, it is difficult to compare the responding sample to the population, where nearly all students mark their age during the application and/or registration process.

Table 3

Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Degree Level and by Age Breakout

Degree Level and Age Breakout	Responding Sample	
	N	%
Undergraduate		
≤ 25 Years	184	26
≥ 26 Years	175	11
All Respondents	408	15
First Professional		
≤ 25 Years	56	8
≥ 26 Years	65	4
All Respondents	128	5
Graduate (M.S., Ed.S., Doctoral)		
≤ 25 Years	402	56
≥ 26 Years	1,262	78
All Respondents	1,878	71
Other		
≤ 25 Years	6	<1
≥ 26 Years	11	<1
All Respondents	18	<1

Degree Level and Age Breakout	Responding Sample N	%
Unidentified		
≤ 25 Years	68	10
≥ 26 Years	103	6
All Respondents	205	8
Total	2,637	

Result: There is a difference ($p \leq .05$) between students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) in terms of representation by degree level (Chi-square = 135.64, df = 5, and $p \leq .01$).

Table 4

Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Gender and by Age Breakout

Gender and Age Breakout	Responding Sample N	Responding Sample %
Female		
≤ 25 Years	484	68
≥ 26 Years	946	59
All Respondents	1,563	59
Male		
≤ 25 Years	229	32
≥ 26 Years	662	41
All Respondents	926	35
Unidentified		
≤ 25 Years	3	<1
≥ 26 Years	8	<1
All Respondents	148	6
Total	2,637	

Result: There is a difference ($p \leq .05$) between students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) in terms of representation by gender (Chi-square = 17.11, df = 1, and $p \leq .01$).

Table 5.A

Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Race/Ethnic Group (All Race/Ethnic Groups) and by Age Breakout

Race/Ethnic Group and Age Breakout	N	%
Black, non-Hispanic		
≤ 25 Years	61	9
≥ 26 Years	282	18
All Respondents	407	15
American Indian or Alaskan Native		
≤ 25 Years	1	<1
≥ 26 Years	11	<1
All Respondents	13	<1
Asian or Pacific Islander		
≤ 25 Years	60	8
≥ 26 Years	46	3
All Respondents	113	4
Hispanic		
≤ 25 Years	124	17
≥ 26 Years	194	12
All Respondents	338	13
White, Non-Hispanic		

Race/Ethnic Group and Age Breakout	N	%
≤ 25 Years	402	56
≥ 26 Years	922	57
All Respondents	1,426	54
Other		
≤ 25 Years	35	5
≥ 26 Years	52	3
All Respondents	111	4
Total	2,637	

Result: There is a difference ($p \leq .05$) between students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) in terms of representation by race/ethnicity (Chi-square = 76.30, df = 5, and $p \leq .01$) when race/ethnicity is broken out into multiple groups.

Table 5.B

Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Race/Ethnic Group (White, non-Hispanic and Minority) and by Age Breakout

Race/Ethnic Group and Age Breakout	N	%
White, Non-Hispanic		
≤ 25 Years	402	56
≥ 26 Years	922	57
All Respondents	1,426	54
Minority		
≤ 25 Years	281	39
≥ 26 Years	585	36
All Respondents	982	37
Total	2,637	

Result: There is no difference ($p \leq .05$) between students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) in terms of representation by race/ethnicity (Chi-square = 1.06, df = 1, and $p \leq .30$) when race/ethnicity is collapsed into these two groups.

Table 6

Reasons for Deciding to Attend NSU[3] by Age Breakout

Reason and Age Breakout	N	%	p	Result (≤ .05)
Academic reputation				
≤ 25 Years	243	34		
≥ 26 Years	554	34		
All Respondents	876	33	≤ .87	(≤25) = (≥26)
Admissions standards				
≤ 25 Years	228	32		
≥ 26 Years	380	24		
All Respondents	657	25	≤ .01	(≤25) > (≥26)
Advice of counselors and teachers				
≤ 25 Years	71	10		
≥ 26 Years	181	11		
All Respondents	276	10	≤ .36	(≤25) = (≥26)
Availability of scholarships or financial aid				
≤ 25 Years	104	15		
≥ 26 Years	146	9		
All Respondents	263	10	≤ .01	(≤25) > (≥26)

[3] Respondents were asked to mark selections against the statement "Why did you decide to attend NSU?"

Reason and Age Breakout	N	%	p	Result (≤ .05)
Convenience				
≤ 25 Years	287	40		
≥ 26 Years	934	58		
All Respondents	1,358	51	≤ .01	(≤25) < (≥26)
Cost				
≤ 25 Years	53	7		
≥ 26 Years	100	6		
All Respondents	174	7	≤ .27	(≤25) = (≥26)
Location				
≤ 25 Years	440	62		
≥ 26 Years	705	44		
All Respondents	1,236	47	≤ .01	(≤25) > (≥26)
Small class size				
≤ 25 Years	272	38		
≥ 26 Years	406	25		
All Respondents	738	28	≤ .01	(≤25) > (≥26)
Social atmosphere				
≤ 25 Years	99	14		
≥ 26 Years	124	8		

Reason and Age Breakout	N	%	p	Result (≤ .05)
All Respondents	241	9	≤ .01	(≤25) > (≥26)
Type of programs available				
≤ 25 Years	385	54		
≥ 26 Years	867	54		
All Respondents	1,360	52	≤ .96	(≤25) = (≥26)
Other				
≤ 25 Years	118	17		
≥ 26 Years	227	14		
All Respondents	376	14	≤ .12	(≤25) = (≥26)

Note: Chi-square values, Student's t-Test values, and F values are available on request for this table and all other tables that have multiple p values presented in the table.

Table 7

Number of Courses Completed in This Academic Program by Age Breakout

Number of Courses and Age Breakout	N	%	Number of Courses and Age Breakout	N	%
≤ 25 Years					
0	205	29	5	16	2
1	62	9	6	21	3
2	75	11	7	19	3
3	11	2	8	23	3
4	21	3	9 or more	240	34
			Unidentified	23	3
			N	693	
			Mean	4.35	
			SD	3.93	
≥ 26 Years					
0	270	17	5	84	5
1	60	4	6	138	9
2	127	8	7	81	5
3	102	6	8	102	6
4	130	8	9 or more	488	30
			Unidentified	34	2
			N	1,582	
			Mean	5.16	
			SD	3.42	

Number of Courses and Age Breakout	N	%	Number of Courses and Age Breakout	N	%
All Respondents					
0	509	19	5	115	4
1	131	5	6	179	7
2	218	8	7	109	4
3	130	5	8	142	5
4	165	6	9 or more	825	31
			Unidentified	114	4
			N	2,440	
			Mean	5.00	
			SD	3.59	

Result: There is a difference ($p \leq .05$) between students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) in terms of representation by number of courses completed in this academic program (Student's t-Test value = -4.98, df = 2,273, and $p \leq .01$).

Table 8

Frequency of Library Usage by Age Breakout

Library Usage Statement and Frequency of Weekly Use by Age Breakout	N	%
≤ 25 Years		
During a typical term, I usually use NSU's libraries or library provided services		
0 times per week	118	17
1 time per week	126	18
2 times per week	111	16
3 times per week	92	13
4 times per week	55	8
5 or more times per week	125	17
No response	89	12
	N	627
	Mean	2.80
	SD	3.67
During a typical term, I usually use other libraries		
0 times per week	354	49
1 time per week	102	14
2 times per week	61	9
3 times per week	44	6
4 times per week	15	2

Library Usage Statement and Frequency of Weekly Use by Age Breakout	N	%
5 or more times per week	22	3
No response	118	17
N	598	
Mean	1.08	
SD	3.01	
≥ 26 Years		
During a typical term, I usually use NSU's libraries or library provided services		
0 times per week	381	24
1 time per week	310	19
2 times per week	210	13
3 times per week	166	10
4 times per week	57	4
5 or more times per week	147	9
No response	345	21
N	1,271	
Mean	1.97	
SD	2.65	
During a typical term, I usually use other libraries		
0 times per week	441	27
1 time per week	341	21
2 times per week	225	14
3 times per week	112	7

Library Usage Statement and Frequency of Weekly Use by Age Breakout	N	%
4 times per week	46	3
5 or more times per week	73	5
No response	378	23
	N	1,238
	Mean	1.45
	SD	1.88
All Respondents		
During a typical term, I usually use NSU's libraries or library provided services		
0 times per week	552	21
1 time per week	465	18
2 times per week	340	13
3 times per week	271	10
4 times per week	125	5
5 or more times per week	290	11
No response	594	23
	N	1,985
	Mean	2.21
	SD	2.99
During a typical term, I usually use other libraries		
0 times per week	829	31
1 time per week	483	18
2 times per week	319	12

Library Usage Statement and Frequency of Weekly Use by Age Breakout	N	%
3 times per week	179	7
4 times per week	70	3
5 or more times per week	107	4
No response	650	25
	N	1,929
	Mean	1.35
	SD	2.28

Result: There is a difference ($p \leq .05$) between students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) in terms of representation by use of NSU's libraries or library provided services (Student's t-Test value = 5.64, df = 1,896, and $p \leq .01$).

Result: There is a difference ($p \leq .05$) between students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) in terms of representation by use of other libraries (Student's t-Test value = -3.25, df = 1,834, and $p \leq .01$).

Table 9

What Survey Respondents Would Have Done If They Had Not Attended Nova Southeastern University[4] by Age Breakout

Response and Age Breakout	N	%
≤ 25 Years		
Attend another private college or university in South Florida	107	15
Attend another private college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida	32	5
Attend a private college or university in another state	139	19
Attend a state college or university in South Florida	90	13
Attend a state college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida	72	10
Attend a state college or university in another state	85	12
Not attend a college or university	16	2
Other	44	6
Unidentified	131	18
≥ 26 Years		
Attend another private college or university in South Florida	245	15
Attend another private college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida	71	4
Attend a private college or university in another state	199	12
Attend a state college or university in South Florida	180	11

[4] Respondents were asked to mark selections against the statement "What would you have done if you had not attended NSU?

Response and Age Breakout	N	%
Attend a state college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida	101	6
Attend a state college or university in another state	266	17
Not attend a college or university	186	12
Other	130	8
Unidentified	238	15
All Respondents		
Attend another private college or university in South Florida	383	15
Attend another private college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida	112	4
Attend a private college or university in another state	375	14
Attend a state college or university in South Florida	300	11
Attend a state college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida	189	7
Attend a state college or university in another state	389	15
Not attend a college or university	226	9
Other	198	8
Unidentified	465	18

Result: There is a difference ($p \leq .05$) between students in the two age groups (≤ 25 years and ≥ 26 years) in terms of representation by choices if they had not attended NSU (Chi-square = 87.17, df = 7, and $p \leq .01$).

Table 10

Technology-Based Media Experienced in Courses by Age Breakout

Technology-Based Medium and Age Breakout	N	%	p	Result (≤ .05)
Audiob dge				
≤ 25 Years	23	3		
≥ 26 Years	168	10		
All Respondents	242	9	≤ .01	(≤25) < (≥26)
Compressed Video				
≤ 25 Years	37	5		
≥ 26 Years	120	7		
All Respondents	177	7	≤ .04	(≤25) < (≥26)
Electronic Mail				
≤ 25 Years	418	58		
≥ 26 Years	718	44		
All Respondents	1,233	47	≤ .01	(≤25) > (≥26)
Electronic Classroom				
≤ 25 Years	125	18		
≥ 26 Years	244	15		
All Respondents	406	15	≤ .15	(≤25) = (≥26)
World Wide Web				

Technology-Based Medium and Age Breakout	N	%	p	Result (≤ .05)
≤ 25 Years	399	56		
≥ 26 Years	684	42		
All Respondents	1,187	45	≤ .01	(≤25) > (≥26)
Other				
≤ 25 Years	83	12		
≥ 26 Years	132	8		
All Respondents	231	9	≤ .01	(≤25) > (≥26)

Table 11

Statements[5] About *Faculty* by Age Breakout

Survey Statement and Age Breakout	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD	p	Result (≤ .05)
Competency of the faculty							
≤ 25 Years	701	4	4	4.1	0.8		
≥ 26 Years	1,549	4	4	4.2	0.8		
All Respondents	2,537	4	4	4.2	0.8	≤ .43	(≤25) = (≥26)
Access to full-time faculty, either through direct contact or other means							
≤ 25 Years	674	4	4	4.2	0.9		

[5] Respondents were directed to use the following rating scale for these statements:

1	Very Dissatisfied	N/A	Not Applicable
2	Dissatisfied	U	Unknown or Unable to Answer
3	Neutral, Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied		
4	Satisfied		
5	Very Satisfied		

Survey Statement and Age Breakout	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD	p	Result (≤ .05)
≥ 26 Years	1,457	4	4	4.0	1.0		
All Respondents	2,394	4	4	4.0	1.0	≤ .01	(≤25) > (≥26)
Interaction with full-time faculty, either through direct contact or other means							
≤ 25 Years	680	4	4	4.1	0.9		
≥ 26 Years	1,461	4	4	4.0	1.0		
All Respondents	2,410	4	4	4.0	1.0	≤ .01	(≤25) > (≥26)

Table 12

Statements[6] About *Academic Program* and Age Breakout

Survey Statement and Age Breakout	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD	p	Result (≤ .05)
Opportunity for intellectual growth							
≤ 25 Years	706	4	4	4.2	0.8		
≥ 26 Years	1,582	5	4	4.3	0.8		
All Respondents	2,584	5	4	4.3	0.8	≤ .93	(≤25) = (≥26)
Opportunity for peer interaction							
≤ 25 Years	708	5	4	4.2	0.9		
≥ 26 Years	1,590	5	4	4.3	0.8		
All Respondents	2,592	5	4	4.3	0.9	≤ .04	(≤25) < (≥26)

[6] Respondents were directed to use the following rating scale for these statements:

1	Very Dissatisfied	N/A	Not Applicable
2	Dissatisfied	U	Unknown or Unable to Answer
3	Neutral, Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied		
4	Satisfied		
5	Very Satisfied		

Survey Statement and Age Breakout	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD	p	Result (≤ .05)
Instructional methods							
≤ 25 Years	709	4	4	3.9	0.9		
≥ 26 Years	1,590	4	4	4.0	0.9		
All Respondents	2,589	4	4	4.0	0.9	≤ .07	(≤25) = (≥26)
Delivery system							
≤ 25 Years	650	4	4	3.9	0.8		
≥ 26 Years	1,552	4	4	4.0	0.9		
All Respondents	2,486	4	4	4.0	0.9	≤ .77	(≤25) = (≥26)
Quality of the learning environment							
≤ 25 Years	709	4	4	4.1	0.9		
≥ 26 Years	1,595	4	4	4.0	0.9		
All Respondents	2,595	4	4	4.0	0.9	≤ .02	(≤25) > (≥26)
Applied nature of thesis, practicum, or dissertation							

Survey Statement and Age Breakout	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD	p	Result (≤ .05)
≤ 25 Years	477	4	4	3.9	0.8		
≥ 26 Years	1,161	4	4	4.1	0.9		
All Respondents	1,883	4	4	4.0	0.9	≤ .66	(≤25) = (≥26)
Length of the academic program							
≤ 25 Years	700	4	4	4.1	0.8		
≥ 26 Years	1,566	4	4	4.2	0.8		
All Respondents	2,555	4	4	4.1	0.8	≤ .38	(≤25) = (≥26)
Length of the individual courses							
≤ 25 Years	709	4	4	4.0	0.8		
≥ 26 Years	1,581	4	4	4.2	0.8		
All Respondents	2,582	4	4	4.1	0.8	≤ .03	(≤25) < (≥26)
Process for assigning students to advisors							
≤ 25 Years	613	4	4	3.4	1.2		
≥ 26 Years	1,242	4	3	3.3	1.2		

Survey Statement and Age Breakout	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD	p	Result (≤ .05)
All Respondents	2,112	4	3	3.4	1.2	≤ .91	(≤25) = (≥26)
Quality of advising							
≤ 25 Years	591	4	4	3.5	1.1		
≥ 26 Years	1,332	4	4	3.4	1.2		
All Respondents	2,187	4	4	3.4	1.2	≤ .16	(≤25) = (≥26)
Adequacy of classroom facilities							
≤ 25 Years	690	4	4	4.0	0.9		
≥ 26 Years	1,524	4	4	3.8	1.1		
All Respondents	2,491	4	4	3.8	1.0	≤ .01	(≤25) > (≥26)

Table 13

Statements[7] About *Administration* by Age Breakout

Survey Statement and Age Breakout	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD	p	Result (≤ .05)
Clarity of written admission policies							
≤ 25 Years	684	4	4	4.1	0.8		
≥ 26 Years	1,539	4	4	4.0	0.9		
All Respondents	2,502	4	4	4.0	0.9	≤ .27	(≤25) = (≥26)
Clarity of written policy on transfer of credit from other institutions							
≤ 25 Years	561	4	4	3.8	1.0		
≥ 26 Years	1,305	4	4	3.8	1.0		
All Respondents	2,121	4	4	3.8	1.0	≤ .95	(≤25) = (≥26)
Clarity of written completion requirements							

[7] Respondents were directed to use the following rating scale for these statements:

1	Very Dissatisfied	N/A	Not Applicable
2	Dissatisfied	U	Unknown or Unable to Answer
3	Neutral, Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied		
4	Satisfied		
5	Very Satisfied		

Survey Statement and Age Breakout	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD	p	Result (≤ .05)
≤ 25 Years	666	4	4	4.0	0.8		
≥ 26 Years	1,517	4	4	3.9	0.9		
All Respondents	2,454	4	4	3.9	0.9	≤ .01	(≤25) > (≥26)
Clarity of written curricular offerings, as identified in program catalog							
≤ 25 Years	676	4	4	4.0	0.9		
≥ 26 Years	1,514	4	4	3.9	0.9		
All Respondents	2,465	4	4	3.9	0.9	≤ .07	(≤25) = (≥26)
Program orientation							
≤ 25 Years	682	4	4	3.9	0.9		
≥ 26 Years	1,521	4	4	3.9	1.0		
All Respondents	2,481	4	4	3.9	1.0	≤ .25	(≤25) = (≥26)
Course registration activities							
≤ 25 Years	681	4	4	3.8	1.0		
≥ 26 Years	1,552	4	4	3.8	1.0		
All Respondents	2,513	4	4	3.8	1.0	≤ .70	(≤25) = (≥26)

Survey Statement and Age Breakout	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD	p	Result (≤ .05)
Published grading policy							
≤ 25 Years	653	4	4	3.9	1.0		
≥ 26 Years	1,489	4	4	3.9	1.0		
All Respondents	2,412	4	4	3.9	1.0	≤ .31	(≤25) = (≥26)
Interaction with administrative personnel							
≤ 25 Years	672	4	4	3.6	1.1		
≥ 26 Years	1,508	4	4	3.7	1.1		
All Respondents	2,448	4	4	3.6	1.1	≤ .24	(≤25) = (≥26)
Clarity of program catalog							
≤ 25 Years	689	4	4	4.0	0.8		
≥ 26 Years	1,527	4	4	3.9	0.9		
All Respondents	2,482	4	4	3.9	0.9	≤ .03	(≤25) > (≥26)
Correctness of student records (including transcripts)							
≤ 25 Years	593	4	4	3.6	1.1		
≥ 26 Years	1,345	4	4	3.6	1.2		
All Respondents	2,190	4	4	3.6	1.2	≤ .85	(≤25) = (≥26)

Table 14

Statements[8] About *Library and Information Services* and Age Breakout

Survey Statement and Age Breakout	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD	p	Result (≤ .05)
Availability of library and learning resource materials							
≤ 25 Years	662	4	4	3.7	1.1		
≥ 26 Years	1,434	4	4	3.9	1.1		
All Respondents	2,348	4	4	3.9	1.1	≤ .01	(≤25) < (≥26)
Adequacy of library and learning resource materials							
≤ 25 Years	657	4	4	3.6	1.2		
≥ 26 Years	1,413	4	4	3.9	1.1		
All Respondents	2,320	4	4	3.8	1.1	≤ .01	(≤25) < (≥26)
Orientation program relative to library services							

[8] Respondents were directed to use the following rating scale for these statements:

1	Very Dissatisfied	N/A	Not Applicable
2	Dissatisfied	U	Unknown or Unable to Answer
3	Neutral, Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied		
4	Satisfied		
5	Very Satisfied		

Survey Statement and Age Breakout	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD	p	Result (≤ .05)
≤ 25 Years	627	4	4	3.6	1.1		
≥ 26 Years	1,409	4	4	3.8	1.1		
All Respondents	2,286	4	4	3.7	1.1	≤ .88	(≤25) = (≥26)
Training in access to information in electronic and other formats							
≤ 25 Years	639	4	4	3.7	1.0		
≥ 26 Years	1,411	4	4	3.8	1.1		
All Respondents	2,300	4	4	3.7	1.1	≤ .29	(≤25) = (≥26)
Availability of computing resources							
≤ 25 Years	662	4	4	3.9	1.0		
≥ 26 Years	1,368	4	4	3.8	1.1		
All Respondents	2,269	4	4	3.8	1.1	≤ .11	(≤25) = (≥26)
Adequacy of computing resources							
≤ 25 Years	659	4	4	4.0	1.0		
≥ 26 Years	1,363	4	4	3.9	1.0		
All Respondents	2,261	4	4	3.9	1.0	≤ .06	(≤25) = (≥26)
Access to information through technology							

Survey Statement and Age Breakout	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD	p	Result (≤ .05)
≤ 25 Years	670	4	4	4.1	0.9		
≥ 26 Years	1,443	4	4	4.0	1.0		
All Respondents	2,370	4	4	4.0	1.0	≤ .01	(≤25) > (≥26)
Instructional support services (e.g., educational equipment and specialized facilities such as laboratories, audio visual and duplicating services)							
≤ 25 Years	605	4	4	3.8	1.0		
≥ 26 Years	1,241	4	4	3.7	1.1		
All Respondents	2,056	4	4	3.7	1.1	≤ .06	(≤25) = (≥26)
Infusion of information technology into the curricula							
≤ 25 Years	628	4	4	3.9	0.9		
≥ 26 Years	1,390	4	4	3.8	1.0		
All Respondents	2,250	4	4	3.8	1.0	≤ .01	(≤25) > (≥26)
Provisions for training in the use of technology							
≤ 25 Years	608	4	4	3.7	1.0		
≥ 26 Years	1,321	4	4	3.6	1.1		
All Respondents	2,161	4	4	3.6	1.1	≤ .01	(≤25) > (≥26)

Table 15

Statements[9] About *Student Services* by Age Breakout

Survey Statement and Age Breakout	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD	p	Result (≤ .05)
Student development services							
≤ 25 Years	510	4	4	3.7	1.0		
≥ 26 Years	915	3	3	3.4	1.0		
All Respondents	1,589	4	4	3.5	1.0	≤ .51	(≤25) = (≥26)
Counseling and career development							
≤ 25 Years	483	4	4	3.5	1.0		
≥ 26 Years	932	3	3	3.2	1.2		
All Respondents	1,583	3	3	3.3	1.1	≤ .46	(≤25) = (≥26)
Remedial services available							
≤ 25 Years	380	3	3	3.5	1.0		
≥ 26 Years	729	3	3	3.3	1.1		

[9] Respondents were directed to use the following rating scale for these statements:

1	Very Dissatisfied	N/A	Not Applicable
2	Dissatisfied	U	Unknown or Unable to Answer
3	Neutral, Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied		
4	Satisfied		
5	Very Satisfied		

Survey Statement and Age Breakout	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD	p	Result (≤ .05)
All Respondents	1,256	3	3	3.3	1.0	≤ .95	(≤25) = (≥26)
Student government opportunities							
≤ 25 Years	527	4	4	3.7	1.0		
≥ 26 Years	756	3	3	3.5	1.0		
All Respondents	1,419	3	4	3.5	1.0	≤ .50	(≤25) = (≥26)
Student behavior policies and procedures							
≤ 25 Years	573	4	4	3.7	1.0		
≥ 26 Years	937	4	4	3.6	1.0		
All Respondents	1,679	4	4	3.6	1.0	≤ .64	(≤25) = (≥26)
Financial aid services							
≤ 25 Years	640	1	2	2.7	1.4		
≥ 26 Years	1,222	4	3	2.9	1.4		
All Respondents	2,086	1	3	2.8	1.4	≤ .27	(≤25) = (≥26)
Health services							
≤ 25 Years	477	4	4	3.5	1.1		
≥ 26 Years	658	3	3	3.3	1.1		
All Respondents	1,259	3	3	3.4	1.1	≤ .09	(≤25) = (≥26)

Survey Statement and Age Breakout	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD	p	Result (≤ .05)
Refund policies when withdrawing from courses							
≤ 25 Years	354	3	3	3.3	1.2		
≥ 26 Years	782	3	3	3.4	1.1		
All Respondents	1,285	3	3	3.4	1.1	≤ .06	(≤25) = (≥26)
Safety and security of classroom buildings and the learning environment							
≤ 25 Years	664	4	4	4.0	1.0		
≥ 26 Years	1,247	4	4	4.0	1.0		
All Respondents	2,124	4	4	3.9	1.0	≤ .70	(≤25) = (≥26)

Table 16

Statements About *Summary Evaluation*[10] by Age Breakout

Academic Center and Age Breakout	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD	p	Result (≤ .05)
≤ 25 Years	626	4	4	4.0	0.8		
≥ 26 Years	1,249	4	4	4.1	0.8		
All Respondents	2,067	4	4	4.0	0.8	≤ .43	(≤25) = (≥26)

[10] Respondents were directed to use the following rating scale to mark their level of satisfaction with the single statement: *Overall quality of this academic program.*

1	Very Dissatisfied	N/A	Not Applicable
2	Dissatisfied	U	Unknown or Unable to Answer
3	Neutral, Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied		
4	Satisfied		
5	Very Satisfied		

Nova Southeastern University

Purpose of This Survey:

As part of a continuous process of evaluation of academic support services, the purpose of this survey is to determine your general level of use and satisfaction with resources and services provided by the University. Results will be used to help the University provide an improved educational experience for future students.

Survey Methodology:

This survey is to be distributed to a representative sample of Fall Term 1999 students. Please complete this survey only once. **If you received a copy in a prior class, please do not fill this out again.**

Section I: Program Information

Academic Center/School

01— Center for Psychological Studies
02— Farquhar Center for Undergraduate Studies
03— Fischler Graduate School of Education and Human Services
04— Health Professions Division
05— Oceanographic Center
06— School of Business and Entrepreneurship
07— School of Computer and Information Sciences
08— School of Social and Systemic Studies
09— Shepard Broad Law Center

Degree Program Enrolled

01— Bachelor's
02— Master's
03— Specialist
04— First Professional
05— Doctoral
06— Other

Time at NSU

01— 1st Year
02— 2nd Year
03— 3rd Year
04— 4th Year

Review the following rating key and then mark or circle your level of satisfaction with each statement:

1 Very Dissatisfied
2 Dissatisfied
3 Neutral, Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied
4 Satisfied
5 Very Satisfied
N/A Not Applicable
U Unknown or Unable to Answer

Faculty

1 2 3 4 5 NA U Competency of the faculty
1 2 3 4 5 NA U Access to full-time faculty, either through direct contact or other means
1 2 3 4 5 NA U Interaction with full-time faculty, either through direct contact or other means

Academic Program

1 2 3 4 5 NA U Opportunity for intellectual growth
1 2 3 4 5 NA U Opportunity for peer interaction
1 2 3 4 5 NA U Instructional methods
1 2 3 4 5 NA U Delivery system
1 2 3 4 5 NA U Quality of the learning environment
1 2 3 4 5 NA U Applied nature of thesis, practicum, or dissertation
1 2 3 4 5 NA U Length of the academic program
1 2 3 4 5 NA U Length of the individual courses
1 2 3 4 5 NA U Process for assigning students to advisors

Review the following rating key and then mark or circle your level of satisfaction with each statement:

1	Very Dissatisfied	N/A	Not Applicable
2	Dissatisfied	U	Unknown or Unable to Answer
3	Neutral, Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied		
4	Satisfied		
5	Very Satisfied		

1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Quality of advising
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Adequacy of classroom facilities

Administration

1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Clarity of written admission policies
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Clarity of written policy on transfer of credit from other institutions
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Clarity of written completion requirements
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Clarity of written curricular offerings, as identified in program catalog
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Program orientation
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Course registration activities
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Published grading policy
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Interaction with administrative personnel
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Clarity of program catalog
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Correctness of student records (including transcripts)

Library and Information Services

1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Availability of library and learning resource materials
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Adequacy of library and learning resource materials
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Orientation program relative to library services
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Training in access to information in electronic and other formats
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Availability of computing resources
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Adequacy of computing resources
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Access to information through technology
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Instructional support services (e.g., educational equipment and specialized facilities such as laboratories, audio visual and duplicating services)
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Infusion of information technology into the curricula
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Provisions for training in the use of technology

Student Services

1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Student development services
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Counseling and career development
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Remedial services available
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Student government opportunities
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Student behavior policies and procedures
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Financial aid services
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Health services
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Refund policies when withdrawing from courses
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Safety and security of classroom buildings and the learning environment

Review the following rating key and then mark or circle your level of satisfaction with each statement:

1	Very Dissatisfied	N/A	Not Applicable
2	Dissatisfied	U	Unknown or Unable to Answer
3	Neutral, Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied		
4	Satisfied		
5	Very Satisfied		

Summary Evaluation

1 2 3 4 5 NA U Overall quality of this academic program

As a note of special interest, if you do not regularly use NSU's library/information resources, please tell us how you prepare(d) for papers/research. What facilities do you use, and how do you gain access to the resources? Possibly because of your employment status, does your employer provide access to better services than the level of services the University offers to students?

Further, it would also be very useful if you offered specific examples of how you gain access to resources and information if you are either: (1) physically distant from the University's campus-based infrastructure, (2) unable to conveniently use campus-based resources even if you reside near the University's four South Florida campuses.

Section II: Demographic Information

Where do you attend the majority of your classes?

01 Davie Campus or East Campus
02 Cluster Location in Broward County or Miami-Dade County
03 Cluster Location in Another Florida County
04 Cluster Location in Another State
05 Cluster Location in Another Country
06 Other

Race/Ethnic Group:

01 Black, non-Hispanic
02 American Indian or Alaskan Native
03 Asian or Pacific Islander
04 Hispanic
05 White, non-Hispanic
06 Other

Current age ___ years

Gender ___ Female
___ Male

Home Zip Code _____

During a typical term, I usually use NSU's libraries or library provided services _____ times per week.

During a typical term, I usually use other libraries _____ times a week.

Why did you decide to attend NSU?
Check all selections that apply.

01___ Academic reputation
02___ Admissions standards
03___ Advice of counselors and teachers
04___ Availability of scholarships or financial aid
05___ Convenience
06___ Cost
07___ Location
08___ Small class size
09___ Social atmosphere
10___ Type of programs available
11___ Other

What would you have done if you had not attended NSU? Would you have attended:

01___ Another private college or university in South Florida
02___ Another private college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida
03___ A private college or university in another state
04___ A state college or university in South Florida
05___ A state college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida
06___ A state college or university in another state
07___ Not attended a college or university
08___ Other

How many courses have you completed in this academic program at the University?

00___ 0 courses
01___ 1 course
02___ 2 courses
03___ 3 courses
04___ 4 courses
05___ 5 courses
06___ 6 courses
07___ 7 courses
08___ 8 courses
09___ 9 or more

If you have received technology-based instruction in any of your courses, which media have you experienced?
Check all selections that apply.

01___ Audiobridge
02___ Compressed Video
03___ Electronic Mail
04___ Electronic Classroom
05___ World Wide Web
06___ Other

A list of majors at Nova Southeastern University is attached. Please record here the number that corresponds with your major: _____

Use the remaining space on this page for any additional comments that you may wish to add.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS SURVEY PROCESS IS APPRECIATED.

Prepared by Research and Planning
September 1999

Majors, Specializations, and Concentrations Offered by NSU

Doctoral Degree Majors

01 Au.D. Audiology major

Doctor of Business Administration with specializations in:

- 02 Accounting
- 03 Finance
- 04 Health Services Administration
- 05 Human Resource Management
- 06 Information Technology Management
- 07 International Management
- 08 Management
- 09 Marketing

10 D.M.D. Dental Medicine

Doctor of Education with specializations in:

- 11 Adult Education
- 12 Computing and Information Technology
- 13 Health Care Education
- 14 Higher Education
- 15 Vocational, Technical, and Occupational Education

16 Ed.D. in Child and Youth Studies

17 Ed.D. in Educational Leadership

18 Ed.D. in Instructional Technology and Distance Education

19 Doctor of International Business Administration

20 J.D. Law

21 Dr.O.T. Occupational Therapy

22 O.D. Optometry

23 D.O. Osteopathic Medicine

24 Pharm.D. Pharmacy

Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology, with concentrations in:

- 25 Clinical Neuropsychology
- 26 Clinical Health Psychology
- 27 Psychodynamic Psychology
- 28 Psychology of Long-Term Mental Illness
- 29 Forensic Psychology
- 30 No concentration selected

31 Ph.D. in Computer Information Systems

32 Ph.D. in Computer Science

33 Ph.D./Ed.D. in Computing Technology in Education

34 Ph.D. in Dispute Resolution

Ph.D. in Family Therapy, with specialization in:

- 35 Medical Family Therapy
- 36 No specialization selected

37 Ph.D. in Information Science

38 Ph.D. in Information Systems

39 Ph.D. in Oceanography

40 Postdoctoral Master of Science Degree in Psychopharmacology

Additional majors on reverse side

Psy.D. in Clinical Psychology with concentrations in:

- 41 Clinical Neuropsychology
- 42 Clinical Health Psychology
- 43 Psychodynamic Psychology
- 44 Psychology of Long-Term Mental Illness
- 45 Forensic Psychology
- 46 No concentration selected

47 Doctor of Public Administration

48 Ph.D.P.T. in Physical Therapy

49 SLP.D. Speech-Language Pathology

Specialist Degree Majors

Educational Specialist with specializations in :

- 50 Computer Science Education
- 51 Curriculum, Instruction, and Technology
- 52 Educational Leadership
- 53 Educational Media
- 54 Educational Technology
- 55 Elementary Education
- 56 Emotionally Handicapped
- 57 English Education
- 58 Management and Administration of Educational Programs
- 59 Mathematics Education
- 60 Mentally Handicapped
- 61 Multicultural Education
- 62 Prekindergarten/Primary
- 63 Reading
- 64 Science Education
- 65 Social Studies Education
- 66 Specific Learning Disabilities
- 67 Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)
- 68 Varying Exceptionalities

Master's Degree Majors

69 Master of Accounting

70 M.B.S. Biomedical Sciences

Master of Business Administration with specializations in:

- 71 Accounting
- 72 Entrepreneurship
- 73 Finance
- 74 Human Resource Management
- 75 International Business
- 76 Management Information Systems
- 77 Marketing
- 78 Medical Management
- 79 Public Administration

80 Master of International Business Administration

81 M.M.S. Medical Science

82 M.O.T. Occupational Therapy

83 M.P.T. Physical Therapy

Master of Public Administration with concentrations in:

- 84 City Management
- 85 Coastal Zone Management
- 86 Cultural Resource Management
- 87 Dispute Resolution
- 88 Human Resource Management
- 89 International Administration
- 90 Management
- 91 Non-Profit Management

M.P.H. Public Health with specializations in:

- 92 Epidemiology and Research Methods
- 93 Health Promotion and Wellness
- 94 Health Policy and Management

Master of Science with specializations in:

- 95 Child and Youth Care Administration
- 96 Early Childhood Education Administration
- 97 Elder Care Administration
- 98 Family Support Studies
- 99 Substance Abuse Counseling and Education

100 M.S. in Coastal Zone Management
101 M.S. in Computer Information Systems
102 M.S. in Computer Science
103 M.S. in Computing Technology in Education
104 M.S. in Dispute Resolution

M.S. in Education with specializations in:

- 105 Computer Science Education
- 106 Curriculum, Instruction, and Technology
- 107 Educational Leadership
- 108 Educational Media
- 109 Educational Technology
- 110 Elementary Education
- 111 English Education
- 112 Emotionally Handicapped
- 113 Jewish Day School Programs
- 114 Management and Administration of Educational Programs
- 115 Mathematics Education
- 116 Mentally Handicapped
- 117 Multicultural Education
- 118 Prekindergarten/Primary Education
- 119 Reading
- 120 Science Education
- 121 Social Studies Education
- 122 Spanish Language
- 123 Specific Learning Disabilities
- 124 Varying Exceptionalities

M.S. in Family Therapy with specialization in:

- 125 Medical Family Therapy
- 126 No specialization selected

127 M.S. in Health Services Administration
128 M.S. in Human Resource Management
129 M.S. in Instructional Technology and Distance Education
130 M.S. in Management Information Systems
131 M.S. in Marine Biology
132 M.S. in Marine Environmental Science
133 M.S. in Mental Health Counseling
134 M.S. in School Guidance and Counseling
135 M.S. in Speech-Language Pathology

Bachelor's Degree Majors

136 B.A. in Humanities
137 B.S. in Accounting
138 B.S. in Administrative Studies
139 B.S. in Applied Professional Studies
140 B.S. in Business Administration
141 B.S. in Computer Information Systems
142 B.S. in Computer Science
143 B.S. in Early Childhood Education
144 B.S. in Elementary Education
145 B.S. in Environmental Science/Studies
146 B.S. in Exceptional Education
147 B.S. in General Studies
148 B.S. in Hospitality Management
149 B.S. in Legal Assistant Studies
150 B.S. in Legal Studies (prelaw)
151 B.S. in Life Science (premedical)
152 B.S. in Middle School Science Education
153 B.S. in Ocean Studies
154 B.S. in Professional Management
155 B.S. in Psychology
156 B.S. in Science and the Business Environment
157 B.S. in Science and the Law
158 B.S. in Secondary Education
159 B.S. in Sports and Wellness Studies

9/99

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Fall Term 1999 Nova Southeastern University Students Responding to a Broad-Based Satisfaction Survey: A Comparison of Students by Age (≤ 25 years and ≥ 25 years)

Author(s): Dr. Thomas W. MacFarland

Corporate Source: Nova Southeastern University

Publication Date: 04-01

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: Thomas W. MacFarland	Printed Name/Position/Title: THOMAS W. MACFARLAND; Senior Psy Assoc
Organization/Address: Nova Southeastern University, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33314	Telephone: 954-262-5395 FAX: 413-683-0584
	E-Mail Address: tommac@nova.edu Date: 5-6-03

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
One Dupont Circle NW #630
Washington, DC 20036
fax (202)452-1844